REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-6, 9-13, 15-16, and 18 of this Application under 35.U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sheshadri ("Understanding JavaServer Pages Model architecture", published December 1999, pages 1-14) in view of Bahrs et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,654,932; herein "Bahrs") and further in view of Leech ("Server-Side Form Validation", published December 1999, pages 1-4). Applicants note that the Examiner did not supply the title of the Leech reference. (See Office Action, page 3). On October 10, 2007, Applicants spoke with Supervisor Stephen Hong and received the title "Server-Side Form Validation". Applicants have based the following remarks and arguments on the reference provided by Supervisor Hong. Applicants respectfully point out that the publication date of the Leech reference supplied by Supervisor Hong conflicts with what was stated by the Examiner. (See Office Action, page 3).

The Examiner has rejected claim 7 of this Application under 35.U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sheshadri in view of Leech and further in view of Lindhorst et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,981,215; herein "Lindhorst").

The Examiner has rejected claim 8, 14, and 17 of this Application under 35.U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sheard et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,453,356; herein "Sheard") in view of Goodwill ("Pure Java Server Pages," published June 8, 2000, pages 1-4, 1a, 2a, 3a, 4a, and G1) and further in view of Jeyaraman (U.S. Patent No. 6,331,187).

Claims 1-18 are pending in this application.

Non-substantive amendments have been made to claims 1, 13, and 16 to correct antecedent basis.

No new matter has been added.

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the amendments and remarks is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Sheshadri in view of Bahrs and further in view of Leech

The first issue in this case is whether claims 1-6, 9-13, and 18 are unpatentable over Sheshadri in view of Bahrs and further in view of Leech under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claim 1 recites "a computer program product" with the following limitations:

"providing a server-side framework to an application, the server-side framework being external to the application, the framework supporting predefined data types, each data type having a predefined rule;

receiving from an application a request for an object, the request indicating one of the multiple predefined data types, the object storing a value of the indicated data type, <u>the value being stored in the object in a transfer format and in a process format, the process format being different from the transfer format</u>;

creating the object in response to the request;

generating a markup language page that includes the value in the transfer format read from the object;

sending the markup language page to a browser on a client;

receiving a new value in the transfer format from the browser;

<u>storing in the object the new value in the transfer format</u>, the object <u>automatically converting the new value from the transfer format to the process format</u>, the object storing the new value of the data attribute in the process format, the object automatically checking the compliance of the new value in the process format with the predefined rule; and

if the data complies with the predefined rule, forwarding the new value in the process format from the object to the application and otherwise automatically resending the markup language page to the browser with the new value in the transfer format."

(Claim 1)(Emphasis added).

According to the Examiner, Sheshadri teaches "the CD object stores a value of the indicated data type in a transfer format, and a process format." (See Office Action, pg. 4). Applicants respectfully point out that the Examiner's characterization of Sheshadri is not on point since it does not disclose the limitation "the value being stored in the object in a transfer format and in a process format, the process format being different from the transfer format" of claim 1. Rather, Sheshadri teaches a CD object <u>storing each data type in only one format</u>. The Examiner has stated the setPrice function casts the price data type from a string format to a float format. (See Office Action, pg. 4). While this may be true, the CD object only stores the price in float format. (See Sheshadri, Listing 3). Therefore, only one format is stored in the CD object for the price data type. Since Sheshadri only stores one format, many of the other features and limitations of claim 1, including the element "automatically converting the new value from the

transfer format to the process format," are glaringly absent from this reference. Accordingly, the differences between a combination of Sheshadri, Bahrs, and Leech would still be substantially different than the invention set forth in claim 1.

Moreover, the Examiner has stated Sheshadri teaches the element "receiving a new value in the transfer format from the browser for replacing the value stored in the object" of claim 1. For support, the Examiner has referenced the "ADD" action disclosed in Sheshadri. (See Office Action, pg. 4). Applicants respectfully point out that while the "ADD" action may be initiated from the browser to add CD objects to a purchasing list, it <u>does not store in the object the new value in the transfer format</u> as set forth in claims 1. (See Sheshadri, Listing 3). Since Sheshadri lacks numerous features set forth in claim 1, and since Shesadri is the primary reference relied on by the Examiner as grounds for this rejection, it is clear that a combination of Sheshadri, Bahrs, and Leech would still be substantially different than the invention set forth in claim 1. Therefore, such a combination cannot render claim 1 obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103 for at least these reasons and others. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1.

Claim 4 recites the limitations of claim 1 plus the following limitations:

"wherein the predefined rule is external to the object."

(Claim 4).

Applicants respectfully point out that the Examiner has provided inadequate support for the rejection of claim 4. The Examiner has stated Leech teaches enforcement of validation rules on the client side. This is not the case. Rather, Leech discloses only the general advantages and disadvantages of client-side validation in comparison to server-side validation. (See Leech, pg. 1). This general overview of client-side validation does not teach how to implement validation rules on the client side. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 4.

Claims 2-3, 5-6, and 9-12 are dependent claims that include all the limitations of claim 1 and include additional limitations. Therefore, these claims are allowable for at least the same or similar reasons.

Claim 13 recites a method with the following limitations:

"providing a server-side framework to an application, the server-side framework being external to the application, the framework supporting predefined data types, each data type having a predefined rule;

receiving from an application a request for an object, the request indicating one of the multiple predefined data types, the object storing a value of the indicated data type, the value being stored in the object in a transfer format and in a process format, the process format being different from the transfer format;

creating the object in response to the request;

generating a markup language page that includes the value in the transfer format read from the object;

sending the markup language page to a browser on a client;

receiving a new value in the transfer format from the browser;

storing in the object the new value in the transfer format, the object automatically converting the new value from the transfer format to the process format, the object automatically checking the compliance of the new value in the process format with the predefined rule; and

if the data complies with the predefined rule, forwarding the new value in the process format from the object to the application and otherwise automatically resending the markup language page to the browser with the new value in the transfer format."

(Claim 13).

According to the Examiner, claim 13, for a method performing a similar method as the product in claim 1, is rejected under the same rationale. Applicants respectfully submit the arguments with respect to claim 1 here by reference. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 13.

Claim 15 is a dependent claim that includes all the limitations of claim 13 and include additional limitations. Therefore, this claim is allowable for at least the same or similar reasons.

Claim 16 recites an apparatus with the following limitations:

"means for providing a server-side framework to an application, the server-side framework being external to the application, the framework supporting predefined data types, each data type having a predefined rule;

means for receiving from an application a request for an object, the request indicating one of the multiple predefined data types, the object storing a value of the indicated data type, the

value being stored in the object in a transfer format and in a process format, the process format being different from the transfer format;

> means for creating the object in response to the request;
> means for generating a markup language page that includes the value in the transfer format read from the object;
> means for sending the markup language page to a browser on a client;
> means for receiving a new data value in the transfer format from the browser;
> means for storing in the object the new value in the transfer format, the object automatically converting the new value from the transfer format to the process format, the object automatically checking the compliance of the new value in the process format with the predefined rule; and
> means for forwarding the new value in the process format from the object to the application, if the data complies with the predefined rule, and otherwise automatically resending the markup language page to the browser with the new value in the transfer format."

(Claim 16).

According to the Examiner, claim 16, for an apparatus performing a similar method as the product in claim 1, is rejected under the same rationale. Applicants respectfully submit the arguments with respect to claim 1 here by reference. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 16.

Claim 18 is a dependent claim that includes all the limitations of claim 16 and include additional limitations. Therefore, this claim is allowable for at least the same or similar reasons.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Sheshadri in view of Leech and further in view of Lindhorst

Claim 7 is a dependent claim that includes all the limitations of claim 5 and includes additional limitations. Therefore, this claim is allowable for at least the same or similar reasons.

<u>Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Sheard in view of Goodwill and further in view of</u>

<u>Jeyaraman</u>

Claim 8 is a dependent claim that includes all the limitations of claim 1 and includes additional limitations. Therefore, this claim is allowable for at least the same or similar reasons.

Claim 14 is a dependent claim that includes all the limitations of claim 13 and includes additional limitations. Therefore, this claim is allowable for at least the same or similar reasons.

Claim 17 is a dependent claim that includes all the limitations of claim 16 and includes additional limitations. Therefore, this claim is allowable for at least the same or similar reasons.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 408-244-6319.

Respectfully submitted,

Chad R. Walsh
Reg. No. 43,235

FOUNTAINHEAD LAW GROUP P.C.
900 Lafayette Street, Suite 509
Santa Clara, CA 95050
Tel: 408-244-6319